

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 MATTSON TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 APPLIED MATERIALS, INC., et al.,
11 Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-06071-SVK

**ORDER RE DISQUALIFICATION OF
PLAINTIFF'S IN-HOUSE COUNSEL
AND SETTING CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 157, 183

12
13 This Order follows the Court's September 22, 2025 Order Granting Defendant's Motion to
14 Disqualify Counsel. Dkts. 183, 188-1 ("Disqualification Order" and the public version thereof).
15 The background, legal standard, Court's ruling and the reasoning therefore are set forth in the
16 Disqualification Order. *See, generally,* Dkt. 188-1. Left unresolved was appropriate scope and
17 extent of disqualification of Plaintiff's in-house attorneys. *Id.* at 11-12. Having considered the
18 declarations of Plaintiff's Associate General Counsel, (Dkts. 192-2, 199-2), Defendant's
19 submission at Dkt. 197, the relevant law and the record in this matter, the Court **ORDERS** that:

- 20 • The in-house attorneys identified by Plaintiff at Dkt. 192-2, ¶ 3 are disqualified
21 from working upon this litigation going forward. *See also* Dkt. 192-2, ¶ 13.
22 • Plaintiff's "non-attorney support" staff identified in Dkt. 192-2 is not disqualified
23 and may continue to be involved as a paralegal/legal assistant supporting case
24 logistics for new outside counsel (*e.g.*, coordination of communications,
25 scheduling, document collection, etc.). *See id.*, ¶ 13.

26 ////

27 ////

28 ////

- 1 • Based upon the supplemental declaration, the involvement of attorneys at
2 Plaintiff's parent, Beijing E-Town Semiconductor Technology ("BEST"), has been
3 sufficiently minimal such that disqualification is not necessary. *See* Dkt. 199-2.
4 Accordingly, none of BEST's in-house attorneys are disqualified from overseeing
5 the present litigation.

6 Additionally, the Disqualification Order provided that, upon resolution of the
7 disqualification of Plaintiff's in-house attorneys, "the Court will lift the stay and enter an amended
8 case schedule. The Parties may, in their joint stipulation, propose a case schedule for the Court's
9 consideration." Dkt. 188-1 at 13.

10 The Parties did not submit any proposed case schedule amendments. *See* Dkt. 193.
11 Accordingly, the Court hereby sets the Parties for a **case management conference on December**
12 **9, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.** via videoconference. The case deadlines shall remain **STAYED** pending the
13 entry of new deadlines, as appropriate, at the case management conference.

14
15 **SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: November 6, 2025

17
18 
19 SUSAN VAN KEULEN
20 United States Magistrate Judge